

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, APRIL 9, 1910

No. 22

The English Classical Association held its annual meeting on January 10-11; Professor Butcher was in the chair. The first business was the discussion of the report on grammatical terminology to which I alluded recently; but most important from our point of view was the report of the Curricula Committee presented by Professor Sonnenschein upon a four-year Latin course for secondary schools in which the leaving age is about sixteen, i. e. a curriculum that would correspond pretty closely to our four year High School course. The report assumes as a minimum about 150 lessons a year, four lessons a week. The order of progress for the four years is (1) specially composed sentences for teaching the elements, (2) 'cooked' texts, (3) simplified texts, (4) unabridged texts. In vocabulary, to which the Committee attaches the greatest importance, the progress should be during the first year 500 words; in the second year 500 new words should be added, in the third year 500 words more. For the fourth year no number is assigned. The first year is confined to the regular declensions and conjugations and the commonest pronouns, with a few of the common irregular verbs, such as *eo* and *fero*. In syntax only the rules common to English and Latin are to be introduced. In the second year the simpler uses of the subjunctive are to be mastered; to the third year belong the principal parts of verbs and a thorough mastery of the principles of syntax already touched upon; in the fourth year we have a systematic review of the whole of the grammar, both accidence and syntax. Composition is to be taught throughout the four years, at first merely orally.

For the reading the following suggestions are made: second year, simplified stories from Livy, and episodes from Caesar's Gallic War; third year, abridgments of Caesar, Livy, Cicero, Vergil's Aeneid, Ovid's Fasti or Metamorphoses; fourth year, a standard prose work of not less than a thousand lines, and a standard verse work of not less than five hundred lines. In the examinations unseen passages of a style similar to those of the set books must be translated readily.

This report is of great interest to us in view of the recent report of our Commission. It differs from that in many points and our teachers will be at once struck with the small amount of ground that is expected to be covered during the first two years. In our own High Schools the highest mor-

talities is in the second year when, according to our present system, pupils have been brought face to face with Caesar en masse. This of course has been due to the necessity of covering so much prescribed work in the time set and most teachers are agreed that slower progress in the first two years would result in more rapid progress in the last two. Obviously the English report is based on that belief for not merely the amount of work but the grade of difficulty is very much less than that expected in American schools. Of course the advantage of the new requirements as outlined by our Commission is that as much flexibility is allowed as individual teachers may deem desirable and a poor class may be kept at a much slower pace than one of better quality. The English report lays emphasis upon small pieces of reading, much varied, while in the Commission's report the variation is less and the amount of any individual author is likely to be more. One would criticize the English reading as being scrappy; but this may be offset by other merits; see Miss MacVay in The Educational Review for May, 1909.

In the main, however, the English report does not vary greatly from the findings of our own Commission. Prose composition must naturally be taught throughout and emphasis on oral work is in line with the best modern thinking.

The suggestions for vocabulary are very noteworthy from our point of view; they are practically the same as I have been advocating for some time. If carried out these suggestions will require the standardizing of the vocabulary for secondary teaching, which I think very desirable and essential if examinations in sight reading are to be actually valid. Of course the recommendations of this committee apply only to a particular class of schools but it cannot fail to be gratifying that the English and American ideals for this kind of teaching are so nearly alike.

Miss MacVay shows that in actual practice more reading is done than would be supposed from the statements in the report and perhaps the variety of material may conduce somewhat to this result. Judging from our experience with prescribed reading the amount indicated in the English report ought to be much exceeded in practice, for 1,500 lines are an extremely small allowance for the fourth year; and

if we have been able to push our pupils through the first six books of the *Aeneid* in the fourth year with our defective methods, surely we ought to be able to do at least as much on the reformed system.

In this connection, it might be well to reiterate that our Commission was not a Commission of the American Philological Association. That body only devised a plan for the formation of the Commission at the request of the various Classical Associations. And likewise as a matter of courtesy and appreciation, the Commission presented the report to the American Philological Association before publishing it.

G. L.

AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL LATIN IN THE HIGH SCHOOL¹

In the course of the present wide-spread and rapidly increasing demand for revision of our educational system the question has often arisen whether Latin is of any real value in secondary education, or is merely a survival of the unfittest, as sometimes occurs where man has interfered with the operation of Nature's laws. An educational administrator of no slight importance has made the statement that "There is no doubt that the average American high school boy gets less out of Latin than out of any other subject in the curriculum". If this be true—and too many people are already announcing it as a fact—it would seem to be high time for the Latin teachers of the country to take cognizance of it. The question is neither new nor especially attractive to Latin teachers, but conditions are rapidly approaching a point where such criticisms must be met and some changes made as a matter of self defense.

Before undertaking the defense of our present position it might be well to consider why we are in this position and whether it is as strong as we can make it. We are working with a high school curriculum which is a copy, on a smaller scale, of the academic college curriculum, which, in turn, is a direct descendant of the classical schools of the middle ages. Despite the fact that the purpose and nature of the modern high school are radically different from those of the mediaeval college, the curriculum has changed but little. In Latin and Greek even the textbooks and methods of teaching have remained substantially the same. Attempts to adapt the curriculum to the conditions and theories of modern education are ridiculed as 'fads and frills' and the notorious conservatism of the pedagogue prevails in spite of constant complaint and opposition. As a result the present high school curriculum is about as adequate for the purposes of modern public education as mediaeval weapons and armor would be for modern warfare.

The existence in the high school of the present

narrow methods of Latin teaching is due primarily to the fact that in the mediaeval college which the high school represents Latin was logically and actually a technical subject. It is still a technical subject in most college work, and for that reason the college professor generally does all in his power to make Latin a technical subject in the high school. Consequently our high schools, as Dr. Wilson has said, are attempting the impossible by trying to give each pupil both a liberal and a technical education. Latin teachers are among the worst offenders in this respect, since they preach one idea and practice another. From the broad pedagogical standpoint, Latin in the high school belongs to the liberal branches of education, but we find it presented by most teachers as a technical subject, taught almost entirely for its intrinsic value. This method is radically wrong and is the weakest point in our position. It cannot be successfully defended and unless abandoned may bring Latin to the same subordinate position to which Greek has been driven.

In order to retain the position of Latin in the curriculum we should recognize the fact that Latin should be presented in public schools as a means and not as an end. This is the essential difference between high school and college Latin, and the methods of presentation should vary accordingly. With cultural or disciplinary studies the important thing is not the facts of the subject matter, but the mental training acquired in assimilating and handling those facts, and for this reason the method of presentation is of prime importance. The college professor has the comparatively easy and relatively unimportant task of teaching a few select pupils to read and write Latin. The high school teacher, on the other hand, is supposed to use Latin as a means of developing in the many thoroughness of observation, accuracy of deduction, and fluency of expression, an accomplishment far more difficult and infinitely more valuable than the mere knowledge of Latin. The college professor and his classes are ipso facto professionals, aiming usually at the highest possible technical knowledge of the subject, while the high school pupils are amateurs, taking the work for the sake of the liberal training which it is supposed to furnish. In athletics there is a well-established belief that professionalism among amateurs inevitably ruins the work by changing the point of view and raising the standard to a point which is discouraging or impossible for the average amateur. Practically the same thing occurs when the college professor is allowed to set the pace for high school Latin. The necessity of teaching technical points for examinations makes a liberal presentation of the subject impossible, while the college entrance standard imposed upon all indiscriminately produces a pressure which makes the work a discouraging task for both class and teacher. Under such con-

¹ This paper was read at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Haverford, Pa., April 23, 1907.

ditions the lesson usually degenerates into mere parrotlike recitation of vocabulary, paradigms, and translation—the purely technical features of Latin study. A pupil may attain a very high rating in these points, having learned dozens of rules, yards of vocabulary, and countless pages of paradigms and translation and still be among the many who, as Dr. Jordan says, get less out of Latin than out of any other subject in the curriculum.

In order to make Latin of genuine and fundamental value in secondary education, it must be so presented that the emphasis is not upon the facts of the Latin language, but on the mental exercise and habits developed in handling those facts. The work should be of a kind that requires less memorizing and more thinking, less extensive home-work and more intensive classroom work, less Latin and more linguistics. The necessity and value of general linguistic training in the high school and the advantages of Latin as a basis of such work are generally admitted. In view of this fact it would seem that our position could be made impregnable by using Latin as the vehicle rather than as the destination of our linguistic study. Unless teachers adopt that attitude Latin will probably be relegated to a subordinate position in the regular high school curriculum.

To break up the conventional method of teaching Latin as a technical subject, valuable as an end in itself, and to develop the subject along liberal and cultural lines, would require the elimination of many of the eccentricities of Latin as she was written, and the addition of vocabulary and exercises especially adapted for mental discipline rather than the translation of the Classics. It is not probable that Latin can retain its present status in secondary education unless the classical fetish is renounced. No one would think of denying that those who study Latin as a technical subject should read the classical Latin as they find it, but there is no reason why the same rule should apply to the study of Latin as an element of a liberal education. For high school purposes the Latin read should have a vocabulary closely related to English, a style with no unnecessary complications, and a subject matter worth remembering. None of the texts commonly read comes near meeting these requirements, and there is no practical reason why a text could not be written today far better suited to needs of high school pupils than the classical authors are. A short Greek and Roman history, an elementary comparative grammar, and a collection of myths and fables would make an excellent course of reading for high school purposes, and would probably be far more palatable and digestible than the matter now read. With such texts the forms, vocabulary, syntax and prose could be developed uniformly and in a much more systematic way than is now possible.

The vocabulary for such texts should be restricted, as far as possible, to words related to English, and should contain a large number of the post-classical words from which the Latin in English is so largely derived. Word analysis and the study of derivatives should be an essential feature of the work from the very first day, and pupils should understand at the outset that Latin is a very near relative of English and more like English than English itself. It is surprising what a lively interest beginners take in derivatives and word formation, and the English dictionary will enable them to do considerable independent investigating.

Simple words, prefixes, and suffixes should form the basis of the work, and compounds should be learned as such primarily. A pupil who knows *conduco* and *infero* should be allowed an opportunity to try to figure out *induco* and *confero*, although our textbooks make no provision in their vocabularies for any such independent work.

If the drill on declension is to be used for the purpose of mental training, it should consist of rapid extempore translation of phrases illustrating the cases rather than memoriter recitation of paradigms. Every pupil is able to learn the paradigms perfectly and will do so if the teacher will accept nothing else as satisfactory, but it should be understood that the paradigm itself is simply a starting point in learning the cases.

In the treatment of the verb there is need of a very radical revision of the traditional methods. It should be developed synthetically as a logical and regular compound of stem, tense-sign, and personal ending, corresponding exactly to the principal parts, auxiliary verb, and personal pronouns of the verb in English. With such a systematic treatment of the verb pupils in the first term of Latin can soon learn to develop the verb independently from the principal parts and endings. The amount of memorizing is reduced to a minimum, being replaced by processes of synthesis and analysis which are certainly much more valuable pedagogically than the usual parrot-like memorizing and recitation of page after page of paradigms. Three-fourths of the paradigms in the majority of our textbooks are useless repetition and prevent the pupil from constructive work of a kind that is both interesting and profitable.

When a boy has learned the imperfect of *sum*, why should the textbook give in full the inflection of 50 or 60 other words with exactly the same personal endings? After the future of *sum* is given, why insult the common sense or blunt the intelligence of the pupil by printing the full inflection of *amabo*, *rego*, and 49 other paradigms with identical endings? Apparently the editors are devoted to the amiable policy of rendering the work attractive by making it as easy as possible. There is a widespread suspicion, however, that the endeavor to render school

work attractive by making it easy has in most cases so emasculated the work as to make it a mere travesty on education. There is much reason to believe that the Spartan severity of the oldtime pedagogue was much better discipline for the average boy than the mollicoddling methods which have replaced it. While the oldtime schools did not encourage precocity or encyclopedic breadth, they certainly did produce men with strong, well balanced will-power, and the ability to do a few things well and thoroughly, a type said to be too scarce among graduates of the present generation.

Thoroughness in Latin depends very largely upon how far and well the syntactical side of the work is developed.

Syntax, in so far as it concerns the structure of the sentence, deserves far greater prominence than is generally given to it in elementary classes. It is especially valuable for two reasons; first, because it compels the pupil to make a careful analysis of the sentence in both languages, and, second, because it discourages mere memorizing and cribbing. There is nothing more demoralizing to weak pupils than a method of teaching which permits a pupil to get credit for work not his own. In most cases the teacher who allows such parasitic work is doing more harm than good.

Another almost universal fault in elementary classes is the use in recitations of a book with vocabulary, notes, and often paradigms on the same page as the sentences which the pupil is translating in class. The convenience of referring to this information during the recitation leads to a form of cheating and 'near-knowledge' which often misleads the pupil as well as the teacher. Practical experience and comparison have shown that pupils accustomed from the first to reciting without the aid of the book get far better results than those who had the aid of the book in recitation. If the majority of our pupils really learned what they are supposed to learn in the first year's work nine-tenths of the difficulties in the higher classes would disappear and the proposed reduction of required reading would be entirely unnecessary. What we need most in elementary Latin is the elimination of useless technicalities from the first year's work to an extent which will allow thoroughness and intensive work with an abundance of drill and supplementary exercises at sight. Strange to relate, the very persons who are responsible for the overloading of the high school Latin curriculum are the ones who complain most bitterly of the lack of thoroughness in the elementary Latin.

Lack of thoroughness, however, and over-promotion are prominent characteristics of our New York City school system, from first to last, and there seems to be little probability of any improvement, unless the budget makers and their allies can be

convinced that the school problem is of greater importance than the transportation problem, an admission which is not to be expected from New York City politicians.

It seems probable, however, that high-school Latin as a whole could be made more profitable and popular if the teachers could be induced to pay more attention to systematic methods of presentation and less to grammatical technicalities, to emphasize construction, development, and correlation rather than facts, to cover less ground and do it more thoroughly, persistently to discourage dishonest and parasitic work, and to make frequent use of that remorseless drill which compels the pupil 'to get to the point and get there quick'. Although such work might not be popular with the pupils, it would probably appeal strongly to their parents, who are the parties we must satisfy, if our work is to be acceptable. It is foolish to try to make Latin scholars of all our high-school pupils, but if Latin can be made an effective agent for developing the powers of observation, deduction, and expression, it will certainly not be the most useless subject in the curriculum.

C. R. JEFFORDS.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn, N. Y.

REVIEWS

Essays on Greek Literature. By Robert Telverton Tyrrell. London: The Macmillan Co. (1909). Crown 8 vo. Pp. xi + 202.

The Messrs. Macmillan have done a distinct service to the cause of classical letters in republishing, in a single neat volume, these five essays by the former Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. We have too few essays of such sanity, critical acumen, and literary insight, on classical subjects; and those that exist are mostly tucked away in old issues of periodicals not generally accessible. Yet one cannot lay down this volume without wishing that as Dr. Tyrrell and the publishers have done so much they had done something more. It is true that criticism is partly disarmed when the author says in his Preface: "I had thought of endeavoring to bring the studies more 'up-to-date'; but in some cases there seemed little to add, and in others such an attempt would have run counter to the original design". But it is due to those of the classically trained public who still take more than a languid 'literary' interest in Greek and Latin authors to be informed what a scholar of Dr. Tyrrell's eminence thinks nowadays of the questions here discussed, not merely what he thought about them twenty or ten years ago; the Preface is not adequate in this respect.

The essays deal with Pindar, Sophocles, The Recently Discovered Papyri, Bacchylides, and Plutarch.

The first is a temperate but very sympathetic appreciation of a poet singularly difficult for modern readers to enjoy without reservation. Dr. Tyrrell

evidently does so enjoy his Pindar, and seems to believe it possible for every properly trained classical scholar so to enjoy him. He says very reasonably: "... Pindar is essentially a writer of whom it may be said that *l'appétit vient en mangeant*. Those qualities in his style, which some describe as bombast and turgidity, are really splendid proofs of a keen instinct for style that enabled him always to maintain his poetic elevation, though dealing with events which, however glorified by associations, were in themselves not considerable". The essay contains an acute and interesting discussion of Mezger's theory of the construction of the Pindaric epinician odes. The value of the discussion would have been greatly enhanced by an appendix giving Tyrrell's own views of the work of Fraccaroli, Christ, Schroeder, and others; and it is hard to see how this, even though not contemplated in the original design, would have run counter to it.

The essay on Bacchylides is admirable, particularly when read in connection with that on Pindar. To read the two authors together in the original is hardly fair to Bacchylides. He loses, by contrast with his splendid rival, much of the merit that is undeniably his, just as the fertile and smiling valley seems tame to the eye that is still filled with the splendor of the snow-capped Alps.

Sophocles is very skilfully handled in the second essay, which is in large part a glorification of Jebb's monumental edition. In the course of it (p. 52) Dr. Tyrrell indulges in the most violent of the many flings—sometimes decidedly ill-natured, with which the book is peppered: "We are disposed to recommend an adjunct to the Decalogue for the guidance of our rising scholars. Thou shalt not covet the German's knife, nor his readings, nor his metres, nor his sense, nor his taste, nor anything that is his". Of course there is much to be said for the traditional English conservatism in textual matters, even though, as in religious matters, it is desperately afraid that any departure from tradition may be 'unsafe', and lead to exclusion from the everlasting peace of the saints. But it is too often forgotten that even the most venerable of traditions may stop a good deal short of the point to which it professes to reach back, and that proneness to error was quite as distinctly a human failing in the fourth century B. C. as it has been since. Still, one must believe in something; and the orthodox English belief that the *textus recepti* contain in the vast majority of cases word-for-word the productions of the classical authors is at least as reasonable as that of an individual German who is firmly convinced not only that the accepted text is full of mistakes but in particular that he alone knows how to set them right.

The essay The New Papyri is chiefly taken up with the papyrus Ms. containing the greater part of the Constitution of Athens generally accepted as

the work of Aristotle. Dr. Tyrrell gives an admirable summary of its contents, with running comments on the agreement of the data with the facts known, or at least assumed to be facts, from other sources. He refuses to accept the work as from Aristotle's pen, mainly on grounds of style—a very uncertain criterion in the case of a writer whose works cover so enormous a range as those of Aristotle and were produced for such various classes of hearers and readers.

The concluding essay, on Plutarch, brings much of great interest and value, but on the whole is disappointing. In fact, it may be said that any attempt to handle a topic of such magnitude in thirty 'crown octavo' pages is doomed to failure. There are many just and illuminating observations upon Plutarch in these pages; but one may easily fancy that great essayist himself, if he has an opportunity of reading them in the Elysian Fields, saying in the words of the infant in the epitaph:

Since I was so soon to be done for,

I wonder what I was begun for.

Yet it is somewhat remarkable when an English scholar goes so far away from the beaten track of the 'classical' authors. The disinclination of these scholars, as a body, to busy themselves with anything outside of this range is in none too honorable contrast with the eagerness of the wicked Germans to open up all paths of approach to an understanding of ancient civilization, and indeed with the attitude of English archaeologists, who are second to those of no nation in their quest of new ground. A reading of von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's admirable lecture on 'Greek Historical Writing', delivered at Oxford in 1908, brings out very clearly the greater sweep and power and independence of the German *Geist* at its best. It is an endless pity that almost no Germans have ever learned to write so reasonable a style as that which has become a matter of course with English scholars; and Wilamowitz might be even better in French than he is in German.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. D. PERRY.

Studies in the Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero. By Katherine C. Reiley. New York: The Columbia University Press (1909). Pp. ix + 133. \$1.25 net.

This valuable little volume, offered by the author as her dissertation for the doctor's degree, is divided into two parts. Part I, General View, comprises an introductory statement and four chapters severally entitled, The Employment of Greek Words, Prose and Poetic Diction, Prose and Metrical Form, Temperamental and Scholastic Influences. Part II, Studies of Special Groups of Terms, embraces three

¹ Beautifully translated by Professor Gilbert Murray, and published by the Clarendon Press. Only those who have tried Englishing any considerable portions of W.'s compact and forcible German can imagine the seriousness of the task.

chapters severally entitled, The Atoms, Void and Space, the Universe: the Infinity of Matter, of Void, and of Space. Appended is a bibliography of sources and secondary works and an index.

We have in this treatise a serious and dignified attempt to determine and set forth the contributions in the field of philosophical terminology made to the Latin language by the two great exponents of Roman thought, Cicero and Lucretius. In the General View the author states that

the scope of the comparison is narrower than we could wish, for Lucretius concerned himself chiefly with the mechanical and physical side of Epicureanism while Cicero, whose philosophical interests were largely ethical, passed over these elements in a rapid summary. When, however, the interests of the two thinkers touched, we see in full view, just as in the processes of a laboratory, their terminology in the very making.

In the philosophical works of Cicero the author finds 99 Greek words, and only 2 such words in Lucretius — *ἀπουσία*, *ὁμοιομερεια*. 72 Greek terms found in Cicero have no counterpart in Lucretius and hence cannot form the basis of comparison. Of these, 38 are compound, 34 simple terms. Cicero turned 26 of the 34 simple terms into single Latin terms. For the remaining 8 he employed various Latin "devices". He turned only 15 of the 38 Greek compounds into single Latin terms. The remaining 23 he translated by various equivalents or not at all.

Examining the Greek terms latinized by both authors the writer finds that they each converted 16 into a single Latin equivalent and resorted to "various devices" to render 11 others, with about equal success.

Summarizing conclusions thus far the author states that "Cicero shows in general a greater wealth and facility of expression than Lucretius". Yet Cicero's "familiar hesitation between several terms has marred the technical rigor of his terminology".

With a passing remark that the diction of the two authors necessarily affected the terminology of each the writer groups together (page 26) a partial list of 51 words "found only in Lucretius and his imitators". To these a list of 9 "distinctly philosophical words" is added, making a total of 60. A list of 13 typical words occurring for the first time in the philosophical writings of Cicero is also given. This seems to show a marked tendency on the part of Cicero to use coined words only "in the interest of his philosophical terminology".

"Prose and metrical forms" also affected the choice of words. Many expressions available for Cicero must be modified or paraphrased by Lucretius. This restriction of poetic form determined the usage of many words philosophical, and non-philosophical (e. g. *arbusta* for *arbores*), so that we cannot ascribe to Cicero in the use of certain words a cleverness of expression or a depth of sympathetic feeling not found in Lucretius.

The temperament and training of the two men,

as the writer points out, must of necessity affect "the tenacity with which each seized and held a term". But if Lucretius is open to the charge of bigotry (page 30), surely Cicero, a dilettante in philosophy, pedantic in method and quite void of logical system, ought not thus to influence our judgment against a doctrine and its exponents about which he knew little and cared less. No doubt Lucretius's exalted opinion of Epicurus for what he had done to liberate the world from superstition accounts for many archaisms and studied peculiarities of the poet's style and terminology.

Turning now to part two we have the results of the writer's investigations "of special groups of words". In the examination of each group the author states the Epicurean usages, then points out and compares the usages respectively of Lucretius and Cicero, and follows each study with a brief but valuable summary. The investigation shows that only three words in the known Greek of Epicurus occur absolutely in the undoubted sense of 'atoms' namely, *ἄτομος*, *σπέρματα*, *σώματα*. . . Eleven terms in Lucretius are found with the sense of 'atoms'. . . Of these *corpora* and *semina* alone correspond to their Greek prototypes *σώματα* and *σπέρματα*. . . *Corpuscula* and *particulae* have no known Greek originals. . . Four words in the Latin of Cicero occur with the meaning of 'atoms', namely *atomi*, *individua*, *corpora*, *corpuscula*.

The controversy over the divisibility of the Epicurean atom still rages. The writer here takes a very reasonable view, leaving the meaning of *ἄγκυλος* undetermined. The divisible atom seems only a device to explain atom shapes. The *primordia* of Lucretius are *solida simplicitate* and can admit no void.

The atoms or molecules, though not susceptible of physical separation or dissection, are still composed of parts which can at least be distinguished from each other. The atom is *logically* divisible; for as it differs in the shape of each example, it must consist of not less than three parts—parts, however, which are only *mathematically* distinguishable by their different positions or order in the total which they constitute. (Lucr. II, 485). Between such *ideal* constituents of the atom there is no intervening void. . . And thus for all purposes of mechanical cosmogony, the complex molecules, formed by the union of these simple parts, may be treated as themselves simple and elementary (Wallace, *Epicureanism*, London, 1908, p. 177. The italics are the reviewer's).

In approaching the study of "void and space" the writer presents three possible views of the uses "made by Epicurus of the Greek terms *ἀναφής φύσις*, *κενόν*, *τόπος*, and *χώρα*": (a) Epicurus consistently used each of them in a technical sense, or (b) as exact synonyms, or (c) "by his use of the terms he distinguishes between void and space". The conclusion reached is that Epicurus did not "observe the distinctions of meaning assigned by Sextus" to these terms; that they were not used as exact synonyms, and that, though the evidence is scanty, the following distinctions prevail: *τόπος* = 'space', *κενόν* or *ἀναφής*

φύσις = 'void'. "*χώρα* has no technical meaning". Applying the same test to Lucretian usage the result reached is that the poet did not use *inane*, *vacuum*, *locus*, *spatium*, in a technical sense on the basis claimed by Sextus, and that Sextus must be wrong in claiming that they were so used; that Lucretius did not use the terms as exact synonyms, but with the following variations: *inane* = *inane purum*, 'void', usually, but *inane* qualified by *haec in quo sita sunt et qua diversa moventur* (I. 421), "alters the concept from void to space"; that *vacuum* as used by Lucretius involves no controversy as it is a non-technical term; that *locus* is used 82 times in a non-technical sense (*inane* 6 times), and 19 in a technical sense (*inane* 69 times); that *spatium* "is used as a variant of *locus* in the sense of space". Little attention is given to Ciceronian usage here since in treating of these concepts he failed "to develop a rigorous and definitive terminology".

The same method is followed in the examination of "the Universe". The Greek sources here are meager. Four terms appear: *τὸ πᾶν*, *τὸ ἀπειρον*, *ἀπειρα*, *τὸ πλεχον*. The first of these is most definitive and signifies "the whole sum of matter and space". On Lucretius's use of *omne* the writer decides with the majority of critics that this term is equivalent to *τὸ πᾶν*, "the universe of matter and space". In this connection the author finds two groups of words in the terminology of Cicero indicating "the infinity of space, and the infinity of matter and space", . . . "neither of which is defined with perfect precision".

The whole study bears evidences of careful and painstaking research. The results are well attested in the prefatory note by Professor Peck: ". . . Dr. Reiley has examined the prevailing theories regarding certain technical terms that belong to the materialistic philosophy of Greece and Rome, and by an acute examination of the evidence, both ancient and modern, has arrived at conclusions which constitute a distinct contribution to knowledge".

ROBERT B. ENGLISH.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

The Fourth Annual Meeting will be held at THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 138th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, on Friday and Saturday, April 22 and 23, 1910.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 22, at 2.30

Address of Welcome, by DR. JOHN H. FINLEY, President of the College of the City of New York.

A Programme of Reform for Secondary and Collegiate Instruction in Latin and Greek, by DR. BARCLAY W. BRADLEY, College of the City of New York.

Ends to be sought: knowledge (a) of universal principles of language, (b) of character as displayed in art forms. Intensive study is indispensable to the former, extensive reading to the latter. At present it is physically impossible for the average student to read enough in the original tongues to attain the latter end; study of classical works in English translations must therefore be introduced into the curriculum. Outline of a course planned to meet the two ends named above.

The Feeling for Nature in Horace's Poetry, by DR. ELIZABETH H. HAIGHT, Vassar College.

The paper will consider (a) the proper method of approach to an antiquity: the feeling for nature in other Roman poets; (b) Horace's feeling for nature: 1) his life in the country and its benefits, 2) his use of nature in mythological representation, figures, and description, 3) his sincerity as a lover of nature in spite of his own statements and the second Epode.

The Present Status of Latin Text Criticism, by PROFESSOR B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh.

Advances in Text Criticism. Readings once chosen indiscriminately from all MSS. and editions. Introduction by Lachmann of policy of selection of certain MSS. Beginning by Baehrens and others of a thorough search for the best MSS. Present tendency to re-examine all MSS. and to make use of external as well as internal evidence. Exclusive use of internal evidence by careless and superficial workers responsible for the ridicule often heaped upon this important subject. Our opportunity.

What and Why in Greek and Latin Composition, by MR. A. L. HODGES, of the Wadleigh High School, New York City.

An argument that too much stress is laid on Greek and Latin composition in the schools.

Report of the Executive Committee; Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 22, at 8.15

Greetings from The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, by PROFESSOR J. E. HARRY, University of Cincinnati.

Greetings from the Classical Association of New England, by DR. JAMES J. ROBINSON, The Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Connecticut.

The Scientific Knowledge of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, by PROFESSOR JOHN C. ROLFE, of the University of Pennsylvania.

SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 23, at 9.30

The Classical Element in the Poetry of Thomas Gray, by PROFESSOR GRACE H. MACURDY, Vassar College.

A study of the classical originals of Gray's "Startling felicities".

Concerning Vocabulary and Parsing, by PROFESSOR HERBERT T. ARCHIBALD, of Baltimore.

A study of aids to the acquisition of a Greek vocabulary.

References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence, by PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College.

Roman Law and Roman Literature, by DR. JAMES J. ROBINSON, The Hotchkiss School.

Studies in Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris 15, 73, 97-100, by PROFESSOR J. E. HARRY, University of Cincinnati.

Classical Art in the Metropolitan Museum, by DR. EDWARD ROBINSON, of the Metropolitan Museum.

An account of what is being planned and done to encourage an interest in classical art in New York.

Election of Officers; General Business.

Luncheon at 1, for members of the Association and visitors, given by the College of the City of New York.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 23, at 2.15

Byways of Roman Verse, by MR. B. W. MITCHELL, Central High School, Philadelphia.

A glimpse of what is interesting, amusing and instructive in the Poetae Latini Minores.

The Main Points to be Stressed in Preparation for Entrance Examinations in Latin, by PROFESSOR NELSON G. MCCREA, Columbia University.

The Work of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, by PROFESSOR WILLIAM KELLEY PRENTICE, Princeton University.

Roman Coins and Classical Study, by PROFESSOR GEORGE N. OLCOTT, of Columbia University (illustrated by the stereopticon).

The paper will indicate how coins throw an interesting side-light on every phase of Roman history, literature and life, and in particular how they may be used in illustrating the authors generally read in school and college.

The CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

The dates of issue of Volume III will be as follows: in 1909, October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18; in 1910, January 5, 12, 19, 26; February 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; March 5, 12, 19, 26, 30; April 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; May 7, 14, 21, 28.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons and institutions outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. Single copies or extra copies ten cents each.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

**TOWLE AND JENKS'S
CAESAR'S GALLIC WAR**

Text in clearer print than any other edition.

Notes give exactly the help that pupils need.

Grammatical Appendix contains all the grammar needed for reading Caesar.

Vocabulary is made for pupils of ordinary capacity.

FOUR BOOKS \$1.00 SIX BOOKS \$1.25

D. C. HEATH & CO., PUBLISHERS
BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

THE MASSAWIPPI SUMMER SCHOOL

Offers, for its third season, courses in Greek Drama, Latin and Greek Composition, Old French, Advanced French and German, Elementary Spanish and Italian, under Yale and Princeton instructors. The School is located in North Hatley, P. Q., by Lake Massawippi, near the Vermont line. Write

DR. C. U. CLARK,

473 Edgewood Ave., New Haven, Ct.,

for illustrated catalog.

Just Published**ADDRESSES AND ESSAYS**

By MORRIS H. MORGAN, late Professor of Classical Philology, Harvard University

PRICE, \$1.50

Professor Morgan's last published work, representing his experience and views in fields in which he made distinct contributions. The contents are literary, linguistic, and archaeological, and will prove of interest to every student and teacher of the classics.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON

A LARGE VOCABULARY

Can be acquired with the minimum amount of drudgery by students of Latin through the use of

A MEMORY-TEST LATIN WORD-LIST

By George H. Browne, of the Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mass.

This ingenious device provides the vocabularies of Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, Vergil's Aeneid I-IV, and all of Cicero's orations, grouped according to frequency of occurrence, with the English meanings so arranged that they may be instantly displayed or concealed for the convenience of drill work. A circular with sample pages will be sent postpaid upon application.

GINN AND COMPANY: PUBLISHERS

70 Fifth Avenue : : New York City

Dr. Hale's First Latin Book

By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago.

An Unusual Success in Indianapolis

"Dr. Hale's book has been used in both high schools and also in all the grammar schools (12) in which we teach Latin in the eighth grade. It has been an unusual success. This is the unanimous testimony of the teachers. To a remarkable degree it gives interest to the study." — Calvin N. K. Hall, *Sup't of Schools, Indianapolis, Indiana.*

Red cloth, 12mo. Price \$1.00. Why not write us?

ATKINSON, MENTZER & GROVER

Boston New York Chicago Dallas

For back volumes of

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

(\$1.00 each) write to PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City.

CAESAR: THE GALLIC WAR

By A. L. HODGES, Instructor in Latin in Wadleigh High School, New York. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. xiii + 522 pages. \$1.25 net.

The fourth book in the Macmillan Latin Series edited by J. C. Kiriland. It includes the seven books of the Commentaries, a comprehensive introduction, helpful notes, and a complete vocabulary.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
BOSTON CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO

THE STUDENTS' SERIES OF LATIN CLASSICS

IMPORTANT NOTICE — The Johnston-Sanford Caesar (five books) is now furnished with Prose Composition.

PRICE, \$1.25

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

24 WEST 39TH ST., - - - NEW YORK